

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

RAJ K. PATEL,  
Plaintiff,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00130-JHC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's "Response to Dkt. 21 and Motion to Reconsider," Dkt. # 22, and Plaintiff's "Amended Response to Dkt. 21 and Motion to Reconsider," Dkt. # 23.

Per Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1), "[m]otions for reconsideration are disfavored," and the Court denies motions unless the moving party can show "manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence."

Plaintiff has not shown manifest error or new facts or legal authority. He merely restates his assertion that Microsoft, a private corporation, is a government, and subject to RFRA. Dkt. # 23. However, he cites no persuasive authority for this proposition. *See Sutton v. Providence St. Joseph Med. Ctr.*, 192 F.3d 826, 843 (9th Cir. 1999) (holding that the plaintiff must establish that there

1 is “government compulsion” in addition to “some other nexus sufficient to make it fair to  
2 attribute liability to the private entity as a governmental actor” under RFRA).

3 Plaintiff also “submits new claims for further screening” and *attaches* an amended  
4 pleading Dkt. # 23. Per the Court’s prior order, Dkt. # 21 at 5, Plaintiff may file the most  
5 recent version of his amended complaint by April 15, 2024.

6 The Court STRIKES as moot Plaintiff’s first Motion for Reconsideration, Dkt. # 22, and  
7 DENIES the Amended Motion for Reconsideration, Dkt. # 23.

8 Dated this 18th day of March, 2024.

9 

10 John H. Chun  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24